

Title	On the Local Connectivity of the Boundary of Unbounded Periodic Fatou Components of Transcendental Functions
Author(s)	KISAKA, Masashi
Citation	数理解析研究所講究録 (1997), 988: 113-119
Issue Date	1997-04
URL	http://hdl.handle.net/2433/61048
Right	
Type	Departmental Bulletin Paper
Textversion	publisher

On the Local Connectivity of the Boundary of Unbounded Periodic Fatou Components of Transcendental Functions

Masashi KISAKA (木坂正史)

Department of Mathematics and information Science, College of
Integrated Arts and Science, Osaka Prefecture University
(大阪府立大学・総合科学部・数理・情報科学講座)
Gakuen-cho 1-1, Sakai 593, Japan
e-mail address : kisaka@mathsun.cias.osakafu-u.ac.jp

1 Definitions, Notations and Results


Let f be a transcendental entire function, $F_f \subset \mathbb{C}$ the Fatou set of f and $J_f := \mathbb{C} \setminus F_f$ the Julia set of f . We call a connected component of F_f a *Fatou component*. It is well known that a Fatou component U is either *eventually periodic* (i.e. there exists a k_0 such that $f^{k_0}(U)$ is periodic) or a *wandering domain* (i.e. $f^m(U) \cap f^n(U) = \emptyset$ for every $m, n \in \mathbb{N}$ ($m \neq n$)) and if it is *periodic* (i.e. there exists an $n_0 \in \mathbb{N}$ with $f^{n_0}(U) \subseteq U$), there are four possibilities;

1. There exists a point $z_0 \in U$ with $f^{n_0}(z_0) = z_0$ and $|(f^{n_0})'(z_0)| < 1$ and every point $z \in U$ satisfies $f^{n_0k}(z) \rightarrow z_0$ as $k \rightarrow \infty$. The point z_0 is called an *attracting periodic point* and the domain U is called an *attractive basin*.
2. There exists a point $z_0 \in \partial U$ with $f^{n_0}(z_0) = z_0$ (it is possible that $f^{n_1}(z_0) = z_0$ for an n_1 with $n_1 | n_0$) and $(f^{n_0})'(z_0) = 1$ and every point $z \in U$ satisfies $f^{n_0k}(z) \rightarrow z_0$ as $k \rightarrow \infty$. The point z_0 is called a *parabolic periodic point* and the domain U is called a *parabolic basin*.
3. There exists a point $z_0 \in U$ with $f^{n_0}(z_0) = z_0$ and $(f^{n_0})'(z_0) = e^{2\pi i\theta}$ ($\theta \in \mathbb{R} \setminus \mathbb{Q}$) and $f^{n_0}|_U$ is conjugate to an irrational rotation of a unit disk.


The domain U is called a *Siegel disk*.

4. For every $z \in U$, $f^{n_0 k}(z) \rightarrow \infty$ as $k \rightarrow \infty$. The domain U is called a *Baker domain*.


1. an attractive basin



2. a parabolic basin



3. a Siegel disk



4. a Baker domain




Figure 1. Invariant Fatou components

The natural number n_0 is called the *period* of a component U . Figure 1 shows these periodic Fatou components schematically in the case that its period n_0 is equal to one. In particular in this case, U is called an *invariant component*. By definition Baker domains are unbounded but attractive basins, parabolic basins and even Siegel disks can be unbounded as follows:

Example 1. Consider the exponential family $E_\lambda(z) := \lambda e^z$.

- (1) If E_λ has an attracting fixed point, then its basin is always unbounded.

- (2) If $\lambda = \frac{1}{e}$, then it is easy to see that it has an unbounded parabolic basin.
- (3) If there is a Siegel disk on which E_λ is conjugate to a irrational rotation $z \mapsto e^{2\pi i\theta}z$ and θ satisfies the Diophantine condition, then it is unbounded ([H]).

So throughout this paper we assume that f has an unbounded periodic Fatou component U with period n_0 .

Then when is $\partial U \subset \mathbb{C}$ (or $\partial U \cup \{\infty\} \subset \widehat{\mathbb{C}}$) locally connected? For this problem we have the following result:

Theorem A. If U is either

- (i) an attractive basin, (ii) a parabolic basin, (iii) a Siegel disk, or
 (iv) a Baker domain on which $f^{n_0}|_U$ is a d to 1 mapping ($2 \leq d < \infty$),
 then $\partial U \cup \{\infty\} \subset \widehat{\mathbb{C}}$ is not locally connected. Also $\partial U \subset \mathbb{C}$ is not locally connected.

The local connectivity of ∂U is intimately related to the local connectivity of J_f by the following proposition:

Proposition 2. ([W]) A compact set $K \subset \widehat{\mathbb{C}}$ is locally connected if and only if the following two conditions are satisfied:

1. The boundary of each connected component of K^c ($:=$ complement of K) is locally connected.
2. For any $\varepsilon > 0$ the number of connected components of K^c with diameter (with respect to the spherical metric) greater than ε is finite.

From this proposition and Theorem A we can prove the following result:

Theorem B. Assume that a transcendental entire function f has an unbounded periodic Fatou component U with period n_0 . If U is either

- (i) an attractive basin, (ii) a parabolic basin, (iii) a Siegel disk, or
 (iv) a Baker domain on which $f^{n_0}|_U$ is a d to 1 mapping ($1 \leq d < \infty$),
 then $J_f \cup \{\infty\} \subset \widehat{\mathbb{C}}$ is not locally connected. Also $J_f \subset \mathbb{C}$ is not locally connected.

2 Outline of the proof of Theorem A

In what follows we shall assume that $n_0 = 1$, that is, U is an invariant component for simplicity. In general cases similar arguments are valid if we consider f^{n_0} instead of f .

Since U is an unbounded component, it is simply connected ([EL]). So let $\varphi : \mathbb{D} := \{|z| < 1\} \rightarrow U$ be a Riemann map of U . Then the following theorem is well known:

Theorem 3 (Carathéodory). Let $U \subset \widehat{\mathbb{C}}$ be a simply connected domain.

(1) There is one to one correspondence between $\partial\mathbb{D}$ and the set of prime ends: $e^{i\theta} \mapsto$ a prime end $P(e^{i\theta})$ of U .

(2) Let $I(P(e^{i\theta}))$ be the impression of a prime end $P(e^{i\theta})$. Then the following three conditions are equivalent:

1. The Riemann map $\varphi : \mathbb{D} \rightarrow U$ extends to a continuous map $\bar{\varphi} : \bar{\mathbb{D}} := \{|z| \leq 1\} \rightarrow \bar{U}$.
2. ∂U is locally connected.
3. For any prime end $P(e^{i\theta})$ the impression $I(P(e^{i\theta}))$ is reduced to a single point.

Remark 4. (1) For the definitions of the prime end, its impression and the proof of Theorem 3, see, for example, [CL].

(2) Since $U \subset \mathbb{C}$ is unbounded in our case, we should write $\partial U \cup \{\infty\} \subset \widehat{\mathbb{C}}$ in the above theorem.

We also use the following result:

Theorem 5 ([BaW]). Let f and U be as above. Suppose that U is not a Baker domain then every impression $I(P(e^{i\theta}))$ of a prime end $P(e^{i\theta})$ of U contains the point ∞ .

First let us consider the case (i), (ii) and (iii). Suppose that $\partial U \cup \{\infty\} \subset \widehat{\mathbb{C}}$ is locally connected. Then by Theorem 3, the Riemann map φ extends to a continuous map $\bar{\varphi}$ and moreover by Theorem 5 we have $\bar{\varphi}|\partial\mathbb{D} \equiv \infty$, which contradicts the following fact:

Proposition 6 ([CL]). For almost every point $e^{i\theta} \in \partial\mathbb{D}$ the radial limit $\lim_{r \nearrow 1} \varphi(re^{i\theta})$ exists and is nonconstant. Moreover for each $p \in \partial U$ the capacity of the set

$$\{e^{i\theta} \mid \lim_{r \nearrow 1} \varphi(re^{i\theta}) = p\} \subset \partial\mathbb{D}$$

is equal to zero.

This completes the proof for the case (i), (ii) and (iii).

In the case (iv), define

$$I_\infty := \{e^{i\theta} \mid I(P(e^{i\theta})) \ni \infty\} \subset \partial\mathbb{D}, \quad V := \partial\mathbb{D} \setminus I_\infty.$$

Then since U is unbounded, we have $I_\infty \neq \emptyset$. It is easy to see that V is open in $\partial\mathbb{D}$ and $V \neq \partial\mathbb{D}$. Consider the following commutative diagram:

$$\begin{array}{ccc} U & \xrightarrow{f} & U \\ \varphi \uparrow & & \uparrow \varphi \\ \mathbb{D} & \xrightarrow{g := \varphi^{-1} \circ f \circ \varphi} & \mathbb{D} \end{array}$$

By the assumption that $f|_U$ is a d to 1 mapping ($2 \leq d < \infty$), $g := \varphi^{-1} \circ f \circ \varphi$ is a finite Blaschke product. It can be shown that $g(V) \subseteq V$. On the other hand we can consider the Julia set J_g and it is easy to see that $J_g \subset \partial\mathbb{D}$. Suppose that $V \cap J_g \neq \emptyset$. Then from an elementary property of Julia sets of rational maps, we have $g^n(V) = \partial\mathbb{D}$ for sufficiently large $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and since $g(V) \subseteq V$, it follows that $V = \partial\mathbb{D}$, which contradicts the fact that $V \neq \partial\mathbb{D}$. Consequently we have $V \cap J_g = \emptyset$, that is, $J_g \subset I_\infty$. Suppose here that $\partial U \cup \{\infty\} \subset \widehat{\mathbb{C}}$ is locally connected. Then from Theorem 3 φ has a continuous extension $\bar{\varphi}$ and we must have $\bar{\varphi} \equiv \infty$ on the set I_∞ . In particular $\bar{\varphi} \equiv \infty$ on J_g . But on the contrary since the Hausdorff dimension of the Julia set of a rational map is always positive ([Bea, Theorem 10.3.1]), J_g has positive Hausdorff dimension. In particular its capacity is positive. Then it follows that the set

$$\{e^{i\theta} \mid \lim_{r \nearrow 1} \varphi(re^{i\theta}) = \infty\}$$

has positive capacity, which contradicts Proposition 6. This completes the proof for the case (iv).

The non-local connectivity of $\partial U \subset \mathbb{C}$ follows from the following proposition, since U is simply connected, $\partial U \cup \{\infty\}$ is closed and connected.

Proposition C. Let $K \subset \widehat{\mathbb{C}}$ be a closed connected subset and $p \in K$. If K is not locally connected, then $K \setminus \{p\}$ is also not locally connected.

We shall omit the proof of this proposition. \square

Remark 7. It is known that the boundary of a Baker domain U on which f is 1 to 1 mapping (i.e. univalent) can be a Jordan curve (i.e. $\partial U \cup \{\infty\} \subset \widehat{\mathbb{C}}$ is a Jordan curve and $\partial U \subset \mathbb{C}$ is a Jordan arc). The function $f(z) := 2 - \log 2 + 2z - e^z$ is such an example ([Ber, Theorem 2]). In particular in this case both $\partial U \cup \{\infty\} \subset \widehat{\mathbb{C}}$ and $\partial U \subset \mathbb{C}$ are locally connected. So we cannot drop the assumption $2 \leq d$ in Theorem A. It is also known that if $\partial U \cup \{\infty\}$ is a Jordan curve in $\widehat{\mathbb{C}}$, then $f|_U$ is univalent ([BaW, Theorem 4]).

3 Proof of Theorem B

By definition $J_f \cup \{\infty\}$ is a compact subset of $\widehat{\mathbb{C}}$ so we can apply Proposition 2. In the case (i), (ii) and (iii), the set $\partial U \cup \{\infty\} \subset \widehat{\mathbb{C}}$ is not locally connected from Theorem A. So by Proposition 2 $J_f \cup \{\infty\}$ is not locally connected.

Next let us consider the case (iv). If $2 \leq d$, the proof is completely the same as the previous cases. If $d = 1$, take a point $w_0 \neq \infty \in \partial U \cup \{\infty\}$ and $z_0 \in U$. Then from an elementary property of complex dynamical systems there exist $n_k \in \mathbb{N}$ with $n_k \nearrow \infty$ and $z_{n_k} \in f^{-n_k}(z_0)$ with $z_{n_k} \rightarrow w_0$. Since $f|_U$ is univalent we can take $z_0, \{z_{n_k}\}$ and w_0 satisfying $z_{n_k} \notin U$. Let U_{n_k} be the Fatou component containing z_{n_k} . Then it follows that U_{n_k} ($k = 1, 2, \dots$) are mutually disjoint and also we have $U_{n_k} \cap U = \emptyset$. Since $z_{n_k} \rightarrow w_0$, $z_{n_k} \in U_{n_k}$ and U_{n_k} is unbounded, it follows that the condition 2 in Proposition 2 is not satisfied. Hence again $J_f \cup \{\infty\} \subset \widehat{\mathbb{C}}$ is not locally connected.

For the non-local connectivity of $J_f \subset \mathbb{C}$ itself, we can again apply Proposition C, since $J_f \cup \{\infty\} \subset \widehat{\mathbb{C}}$ is compact and connected in this case ([K, Corollary 1]). This completes the proof. \square

References

- [BaW] I. N. Baker and J. Weinreich, Boundaries which arise in the dynamics of entire functions, *Revue Roumaine de Math. Pures et Appliquées*, **36** (1991), 413–420.
- [Bea] A. F. Beardon, *Iteration of Rational Functions*, Springer-Verlag, New York, Berlin and Heidelberg, 1991.
- [Ber] W. Bergweiler, Invariant domains and singularities, *Math. Proc. Camb. Phil. Soc.* **117** (1995), 525–532.
- [CL] E. F. Collingwood and A. J. Lohwater, *The theory of cluster sets*, Cambridge University Press, 1966.
- [EL] A. E. Eremenko and M. Yu. Lyubich, The dynamics of analytic transformations, *Leningrad Math. J.* **1** No.3 (1990), 563–634.
- [H] M. R. Herman, Are there critical points on the boundaries of singular domains?, *Commun. Math. Phys.* **99** (1985), 593–612.
- [K] M. Kisaka, On the Connectivity of Julia Sets of Transcendental Entire Functions, to appear in *Erg. Th. & Dynam. Sys.*
- [W] G. T. Whyburn, *Analytic Topology*, AMS Colloquium Publications, **28**, 1942.